DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 382 SP 008 693

AUTHOR	Edelfelt, Roy A.; And Others
TITLE	Lessons from the Teacher Corps.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	62p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Stock No. 0-8106-6611-1-00, No price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; Evaluation; *Inner City; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This booklet is a nontechnical summary of an extensive sociological investigation of the Teacher Corps, which was restricted to 10 universities and 42 schools. Data drawn from observation, questionnaires, and interviews with teachers, professors, and interns are used to present a composite picture of the program. The document includes a history of the Teacher Corps program, gives reasons for the evaluation study, and indicates methodology used. Two different kinds of information are woven together throughout the report: (a) generalized findings from the 10 Teacher Corps sites studied and (b) illustrative material drawn from two different sites--an urban university and a southern university. The summary of findings reports some intern dissatisfaction and friction with teachers. Specific characteristics of interns and teachers in the program and school changes are among the areas covered in the summary of findings. Conclusions drawn from the study are reported at the end of the booklet. (JA)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NEA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ED 099382

LESSONS FROM THE
TEACHER CORPS

ROY A. EDELFELT
National Education Association

RONALD CORWIN
The Ohio State University

ELIZABETH HANNA
State University of New York at Albany

This is a brief and popularized report of a study, reported largely in *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change*, by Ronald G. Corwin (published by John Wiley & Sons), conducted under a grant by the Ford Foundation to the National Education Association, in cooperation with The Ohio State University.

The National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

SP008 693

Copyright © 1974
National Education Association of the United States

NEA Stock No. 0-8106-6611-1-00

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Edelfelt, Roy A.
Lessons from the Teacher Corps.

Brief report of a study reported in Reform and organizational survival, by R. G. Corwin.
1. United States. National Teacher Corps. 2. Socially handicapped children—Education—United States. I. Corwin, Ronald G., joint author. II. Hanna, Elizabeth Mary, joint author. III. Corwin, Ronald G. Reform and organizational survival. IV. Title.
LC4091.E28 371.9'67 74-18058
ISBN 0-8106-6611-1-00

CONTENTS

Preface 8

Overview 10

Introduction 14

- What Is the Teacher Corps? 14
- What Restraints Were Placed on the Program? .. 16
- What Strategies Has the National Office Used? .. 17
- What Were the Risks of the Various Strategies? .. 19
- How Did the Local Programs Studied Work? ... 20
- Why Evaluate the Teacher Corps? 20
- How Did the Evaluation Come About? 21
- How Was the Study Conducted? 22
- What Were the Special Aims of the Study? 23
- How Is the Study Reported in This Document? . 25
- What Was Southern University Like? 25
- What Was Urban University Like? 26

Summary of Findings 27

- What Was Discovered in the College Experience? . 27
- What Was Discovered in the School Experience? . 29
- What Was Discovered in the Community Experience 33
- What Was Learned About the Interns? 36
- How Did Interns Differ from Typical Teachers? . 37
- What Were the Program Outcomes? 42
- Change in Schools 42
- Change in the University 50
- Changes in Interns 54
- Urban University, Southern University: Forces Affecting Change 56

Conclusions 59

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PROJECT

Melvin Tumin, Committee Chairman, Professor of Sociology, Princeton University

Albert Beaton, Chief, Data Analysis Research Division, Educational Testing Service

D. D. Darland, Associate Director, Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

Roy A. Edelfelt, Professional Associate, Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

James Hall, Dean of Continuing Education, York College–City University of New York

Morris Keeton, Vice President, Antioch College

Gerald Lesser, Professor of Education, Harvard University

Herbert Schueler, President, Richmond College Staten Island, N. Y.

Donald Sharpe, Director, Professional Laboratory Experiences, Indiana State University

Bernard Watson, Chairman, Department of Urban Education, Temple University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are indebted to Gerry Pershing and Jane Power, NEA editors, for their assistance in preparing this report and to Marjorie Martus of the Ford Foundation for criticisms and suggestions in refining the document. Special acknowledgement is due Brice Dorsey Verdier of NEA for her administrative assistance throughout the project.

PREFACE

The original popular image of the Teacher Corps was that of a federally funded program to prepare graduates of liberal arts curricula to teach in inner-city disadvantaged schools through a two-year work-study internship. It aimed at improving the quality of teaching in city slums and areas of rural poverty by introducing a new population and different preparation patterns into the teaching profession.

Lessons from the Teacher Corps sounds like a how-to-do-it book. Those of us who work in teacher education are keenly aware that teachers in training are searching for the magic recipe for teaching. Education students complain that they get vague generalities and theoretical principles when they ask for specific techniques and firm rules. This mind-set of searching for the secret formula may account for much of the expressed dissatisfaction with education courses. Dissatisfaction may inhere in the complexity of the teacher-learner relationship. We know there are no simple rules which one person can hand to another. Perhaps, then, we should adopt the message of a popular poster: "The trouble is that I had lived half my life before I discovered it was a 'do it yourself thing.' "

This booklet, in spite of its title, will not tell you how to set up a teacher corps, nor will it tell you how to succeed in teaching in the inner city. It is a nontechnical summary of an extensive sociological investigation of the Teacher Corps, conducted under the auspices of the National Education Association and financed by the Ford Foundation.

Although scores of universities and hundreds of schools were involved in the Teacher Corps program, this study is restricted to ten universities and forty-two schools. Using data drawn from observation, questionnaires, and interviews with several hundred teachers, professors, and interns, the authors succeed in presenting a composite picture of the program, the successes achieved, the issues faced, and the problems left unsolved.

The Teacher Corps was to do for the slums of America what the Peace Corps ideally did for the underdeveloped nations. There were high hopes that it would appeal to the young idealistic reformer. This booklet helps relate these aspirations to reality while giving some insights into educational change. It does not attempt to determine

whether the Teacher Corps was a success, but it points out in nontechnical terms what various units of the Teacher Corps did, what methods worked, and what problems were encountered. The report is especially timely since Congress is currently reconsidering the future of the Teacher Corps.

Finally, this booklet provides insights into the process of social and organizational change that have broad implications for teacher education. If the reader wishes to pursue some of its suggestions in greater depth, she or he may refer to the major publication of this study, *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change.**

Donald M. Sharpe
Professor of Education
Indiana State University

*This book may be obtained from the publisher, Wiley-Interscience, 605 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10016.

OVERVIEW

This is an abbreviated summary of an extensive study of ten Teacher Corps programs in operation during 1969-1970. The conclusions reached here are based on an early phase of the Teacher Corps (the second and third cycles), and consequently, the details are not fully applicable to the program as it exists today. The program was evolving during the course of the study, and it has continued to change since the study was completed. Nevertheless, the basic outlines of the program were being forged and its direction was being formulated during the period studied. Therefore, much of what has been learned will have implications for long-range policies that are being shaped today—decisions about the future of teacher education as well as the fate of the Teacher Corps.

This report comes at a timely moment when Congress is reconsidering the future of the Teacher Corps. If it has been of any assistance in this task, the project will have been worthwhile. But in addition to the immediate question of the Teacher Corps' future, we want to draw upon the study for insights into the processes of social and organizational change and the broader implications for teacher education.

Several intertwined questions, which guided the study, will serve as themes for this discussion. They are stated briefly here, together with some brief answers. The remainder of the report is an explication and expansion of this overview.

(1) Can a coherent, federally guided program to reform teacher education be implemented in this country?

The report traces the difficulties the Teacher Corps had establishing a viable blend between the firm central control needed to maintain a coherent program and the local autonomy that has been characteristic of education in this country. Varied political interests and organizational pressures in the local districts where the program operated compromised its integrity. This report describes how the program adapted to these political and organizational constraints. The utility of organizational theory for understanding and interpreting reform programs is demonstrated.

(2) Is there justification for attempting to impose a single model of reform for teacher education, however loose the structure?

It proved to be impossible to maintain uniform standards within the program among the wide diversity of local conditions that, in fact, existed. There were great variations in the excellence of the participating schools and colleges, in the characteristics of the populations served, and in the particular educational needs and expectations of each locale. It proved to be difficult to take these differences into account within the single model applied on a national scale. Ironically, the few alternative models that evolved within the program had the effect of dissipating the potential of the dominant model. The issue was how specific can, or should, a national model be, given the local variation? In effect a theoretical national model had to be adapted and structured differently in each local circumstance.

Oppressive stereotypes and simple, single-minded solutions were inadvertently promoted by the uniform-model approach. These stereotypes are implicit in terms such as "the black community," "the black teachers," "the black people," "poor people," and the like. The Teacher Corps was designed to cope with problems that are obviously more characteristic of some groups than of others, but this fact eclipsed the heterogeneity existing within these groups. At the same time, little systematic thought was given to identifying unique principles of learning that might apply to different segments of a pluralistic society.

(3) Can change be produced by introducing outside agents (interns) who have not yet achieved professional status and who differ substantially from the typical professional?

The strategy of using interns as change agents produced discordance. Often it directly challenged existing practices and forced some authorities to reexamine their assumptions. However, the strategy produced very little discernible lasting change, except in a few limited circumstances. The program was not able to satisfactorily weld the change-agent role to that of the traditional classroom teacher and the college professor, just as it was not able to combine it with the internship.

The strategy of introducing change-minded, young new teachers was based on several different factors: (a) their social backgrounds, their

political values, and their attitudes toward teaching differed substantially from those of the experienced classroom teachers and many of the college professors in the program as well; (b) they were both students and part of a change-agent team effort; and (c) there were few settings, either within the program or within public education, in which their impatience for reform could be usefully accommodated. The experience in this program raises serious questions about whether teacher education can serve as an effective mechanism for educational reform, and indeed, whether either universities or schools can effectively lead reform efforts. No matter how well trained the interns or the teachers, it seems unrealistic to hold them responsible for leading school reform while they face the day-to-day, time-consuming tasks and the constraints of their jobs.

(4) Are there strategies whereby teacher training institutions and school systems can cooperate more effectively to improve education?

It was found that when schools changed as a result of the program, cooperation between the schools and universities was largely responsible. The needed cooperation seldom took place, however, and then only because certain individuals in critical, linking roles shared liberal social and political values. More typically, classroom teachers and college professors were relatively remote from one another and remained defensive about their own statuses and the prerogatives of their positions, seniority, and special interests. Some of the conditions that seemed to facilitate or block cooperation are mentioned in the report. However, the study found no sustained effort being made in the program to examine this status defensiveness and to experiment systematically with different strategies of coping with it.

(5) Would schools and universities become more flexible and responsive if members of the local community were given more opportunity to influence and participate in reform programs?

In a sense, this is the most far-reaching issue addressed by the Teacher Corps. And yet, it is also the most disappointing aspect of the program. What community involvement entails was neither clearly defined nor institutionalized, although instances of promising approaches were noted here and there.

The community dimension of the program was undermined by the dominant strategy for change, which was to add new roles and responsibilities to the traditional ones. People were assigned new responsibilities without being provided the necessary authority, time, and new resources. The overload responsibilities, including community activities, were the first to be disregarded under the pressures of time. Furthermore, given the struggle between school and university officials to control the program and its resources, neither were inclined to include members of the community in their plans. It would have been necessary to mandate community participation in order to achieve it, and that was not done. Under these circumstances, whatever community influences were exercised over the program emerged only after the fact, often only when a program was in trouble. Thus, ironically, this potent force for change frequently had a very conservative impact on the local programs.

Yet we believe that, in many places at least, more community participation in such programs is essential in the future. A coalition governing body that includes carefully selected citizens, third parties who in turn might have their own change-agent representatives in the school, could provide incentives for change that neither universities nor schools by themselves have been able to achieve.

INTRODUCTION

What Is the Teacher Corps?

The Teacher Corps was established by Congress in 1965 on the basis of legislation proposed by Senator Edward Kennedy, who wanted to form a corps of experienced teachers to work for a year or two in schools attended by poor children, and by Senator Gaylord Nelson, who proposed to extend the Cardozo Peace Corps Program in Urban Teaching which had been operating in central Washington, D. C.

The aims of the Teacher Corps, as stated in the original legislation, were to strengthen educational opportunities for children in areas where low-income families are concentrated, to attract and prepare people to teach in such areas through coordinated work-study programs, and to encourage colleges and universities, schools, and state departments of education to work together to improve teacher education. To do this, in the words of one brochure, the Teacher Corps was seeking to provide an internship of two years, to involve the community as a training ground, to utilize the team approach for training purposes, to provide for special and continuous supervision of interns, to incorporate the spirit of the Peace Corps, and to establish a closer relationship between theory and practice. It was also seeking to attract potential teachers among liberal arts graduates who might not otherwise have entered education and to extend the classroom into the community.

The beginning of the program inspired new hope for education of the poor, and for teacher education, in a variety of people. President Johnson valued it as a synthesis:

> Our country is blessed with young men and women who desire to serve those less fortunate than themselves. In the ranks of experienced teachers there are others who would devote part of their lives to children in most critical need. The Teacher Corps offers a practical means of uniting the idealism and wisdom of each--young graduates

and accomplished teachers–and thus enriching the lives of coming generations.

Congressman John Brademas drew a parallel: "It presents an opportunity for young college graduates who wish to render service here at home in the same way that young people have served abroad in the Peace Corps."

As teacher education, however, it had no parallel. Donald M. Sharpe, who directed a program at Indiana State University, called the Teacher Corps "possibly the most radical experiment in teacher education ever tried. It can teach the profession a lot. At one and the same time it was trying to prepare teachers for roles that had not previously existed by means that had never been tried." An assistant dean considered it "very safe to predict that the fringe benefits of the Teacher Corps money will be to revitalize teacher education in the United States."

Both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) favored the Teacher Corps. The NEA testified before Congress that "we have supported, and continue to support, the Teacher Corps as an innovative experimental program to provide teachers for urban and rural schools with large concentrations of children from low-income families."

The NEA had surveyed the superintendents and principals involved in the first year of the program and found that nine out of ten thought Corps members had excellent rapport with classroom teachers and supervisors, rated the training "adequate" or "excellent," and planned to continue the program. Other studies found that three-fourths of the school and university personnel thought the Corps was the best way they had ever used to train teachers.

The staff of the national Teacher Corps office were equally optimistic. In 1966 they issued an enthusiastic press release:

> A NEW DIMENSION IN TEACHING. Teacher Corps men and women will be pioneering experimental programs that the schools have had neither time nor staff to develop. They will make inventive use of the curriculum, approaching it from new angles that may "connect" for the hard-to-reach youngster. They will extend teaching beyond the classroom, and look for new ways to involve parents in the mysteries of the learning process. They will work with adult education programs, and with local health and welfare agencies, with youth organizations, social clubs and civic groups. In many ways,

> Teacher Corps members will be convincing poverty children—and their parents who more than likely were school drop-outs in their day—that school is part of the good life, not something they must endure until their "sentence" is up. The Teacher Corps carries the idea of the "lighted schoolhouse"—a place that is open from dawn to dusk. . . .

The program actually began operation in 1966. During the first four two-year cycles, it graduated more than 3,000 interns and 600 experienced teachers. Nearly 250 school systems—about half of them urban and half rural—in 27 states and Puerto Rico have taken part in the program. By the fifth cycle, there were programs in 10 percent of the country's graduate schools of education, as well as three percent of the state colleges. These included schools in 17 of the 25 largest cities, among them New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Kansas City, Miami, Atlanta, Seattle, and Dallas. There were teams in Appalachian towns, in the Ozarks, in the rural South, in migrant communities, in Indian schools, and in Spanish-speaking communities in New York, Florida, and the Southwest.

What Restraints Were Placed on the Program?

Despite the hopes it inspired and the extent of its scope, the national Teacher Corps has struggled from the beginning to overcome the restraints born with the program:

(1) *The necessity of working within the existing structures of public and teacher education.* This subjected the intended function of the Teacher Corps to distortion and cooptation from several sources before it reached the point of action.

(2) *Chronically low and late funding.* One hundred million dollars a year was authorized in the legislation that established the Corps, but the first year Congress appropriated only $9.7 million. By 1972, the annual appropriation had risen to less than 40 percent of the sum authorized.

(3) *Congress passed successive legislation designed to decentralize control and to concentrate decision making at the local level, specific-*

ally in the schools. Since the initial national Teacher Corps legislation the following major changes have been mandated by Congress:

(a) Team leaders must be selected from the local schools

(b) Interns must be recruited locally and be subjected to approval and dismissal by school districts

(c) Interns must not be paid salaries which are competitive with teachers' salaries, and

(d) The programs must be distributed among the states rather than concentrated in only a few.

Other changes have permitted education as well as liberal arts graduates to become interns, and have allowed school districts as well as colleges to become prime contractors. School districts have tended to use their discretion to stress the help the Corps can give hard-pressed teachers in ghetto or rural slum schools, and the mission of change has been neglected accordingly.

The Teacher Corps office is restricted by the fact that budgeting and staffing are centralized in the U. S. Office of Education. Its budget is not at the disposal of the staff; the amount of the operating budget depends on the amount of the grants dispensed. The office is, therefore, understaffed and lacks the travel funds to give the local programs reasonable supervision.

What Strategies Has the National Office Used?

The national office has used several strategies to combat its handicaps and approach its goals.

(1) *It has drawn broad support for its survival from its necessary contacts with existing universities and school districts.* These contacts demonstrate that the Corps doesn't exist in a hothouse situation but is capable of maintaining itself in schools for the poor and in colleges of education.

(2) *Because the program has become highly decentralized, the national office has attempted to make its influence felt primarily through the selection of what programs to fund.* In order to have the most leverage possible, preference is apparently given proposals from colleges that need money. To enable more programs to be funded, each college gets a small amount on the philosophy that even a small sum can provide sufficient financial leeway needed to experiment with change. In the 10 sites studied in cycles two and three, for example, the average grant was $300,000- about $7,000 per intern. The colleges receive eight percent for overhead expenses, but no tuition for the interns. (In order for this level of funding to effect change, the Teacher Corps had to attract proposals from colleges that shared its goals. When the Corps was founded, brochures, press releases, and speeches emphasized the help interns could give teachers and deemphasized the Corps' stated goal, namely, to change colleges and schools. This tack probably helped the Corps survive its first delicate development. Since then, the stress in the publicity has steadily shifted to the role of the intern as change agent. It seems that it became safe to talk about change as the groups who were initially worried about the Corps' effect became reassured; at the same time, the national office let colleges and universities know that proposals involving extensive innovations would be well received.)

(3) *The national office also has tried to maximize the program's impact by funding local programs for alternate cycles only, and by progressively decreasing the funding each year until the program becomes self-sufficient.* Since it costs more to institute a program than to maintain it, the strategy assumes that once the initial costs are met the institution will be able to meet the lower sustaining expenses.

(4) *The Teacher Corps has also maintained itself as a moving target by shifting the image of the intern (from teaching assistant to change agent), by proliferating its stated goals, and by constantly varying its basic program.* Since the goals were never listed in order of importance, the program has drawn support from every faction that supports any of them. And since there are several variations of the Teacher Corps formula—school assistance and teacher training programs for undergraduates, Vietnam veterans from minority groups, and adult and adolescent tutors—the program can draw support from an even wider base.

What Were the Risks of the Various Strategies?

All of these strategies carry risks with them. The very structure of the local programs, for example, unfortunately invites distortion.

(1) *The complexity of the program and the division of responsibilities allows program officers and school people to strengthen some parts of the experience (e.g., classroom work) at the expense of others (e.g., community projects).* Such shifts have taken place either while the program was being planned or during the internship experience.

(2) *The fact that funds have been spread over so many different institutions, many of them among the poorest and least prestigious colleges, almost assures that the Teacher Corps will have no effect beyond the institutions involved.* They generally lack the prestige to influence the character of teacher education throughout the nation, and they are not even large; in fact, only three of the twenty-five institutions that prepare most of the nation's teachers have taken part in more than one two-year cycle. The leading institutions, whose innovations are likely to have national impact, have been unwilling to give up any control to a federal agency for the small sums involved. Heavy funding of a few programs in large and prestigious institutions might have had a greater effect on teacher education nationwide.

(3) *There is little evidence that the temporary character of program funding has encouraged the colleges and schools to carry on the program with their own money.* Rather, it seems that once the funds are exhausted the Corps program is dropped or withers away or loses its original character. Only one in five universities that took part in the first cycle remained through the fifth when the federal financing was withdrawn. Because the programs are temporary, moreover, the program directors, team leaders, and coordinators often regard their positions in the Corps as stepping-stones or stopgaps rather than enduring professional commitments.

(4) Finally, *goal proliferation produces erratic changes in direction and dissipation of effort and leaves interns and other program participants vulnerable to one another's varying concepts of the intern's role.* The alternative forms of the program, while securing support for the Corps as a whole, have drained resources from the basic model. In

projected budgets for fiscal 1970, for example, less money was allotted to the basic model than to the alternate programs.

How Did the Local Programs Studied Work?

The typical local Teacher Corps program was headed by a program director who was usually on the faculty of the college of education. The program was planned mainly by college faculty members. Only occasionally did school teachers or top administrators in the college or university get involved in setting up the program. The college and the participating school district each controlled part of the funds; the proportions varied, but the school district, which paid the interns $75 a week, controlled the larger share. A typical program involved about 33 interns working in five teams. A team was headed by a team leader, who most often was chosen by the principal. There was also a program coordinator in each cooperating school system who was responsible for coordinating activities in the school district with the program director.

The program had a preservice component (college theory and background courses and seminars) of about eight weeks, intended to give the interns and team leaders some special preparation for teaching disadvantaged children. This was followed by the internship itself, during which the interns spent about sixty percent of their time in the schools. They began with such tasks as working with small groups on lessons planned by the teacher; they acquired more responsibility with experience. They spent another twenty percent of their time in college courses that might help them fit their experiences into usable concepts about teaching the poor by providing interns with background information and encouraging an exchange of ideas. The rest of the interns' time was spent working on projects in the school community.

Why Evaluate the Teacher Corps?

The Teacher Corps is a federal program intended to attack the problem of poverty in America by improving education in schools attended

mainly by poor children. The fact that teachers are the part of the school experience that makes the most difference to poor children underscores the significance of this program's efforts to change the way the teachers are educated. The program is based on the idea that change can be accomplished by bringing a new kind of teacher into an established environment and asking the neophyte to help define the role of the professional while he is being socialized in that role. To do this the Teacher Corps brings liberal arts graduates into public schools and colleges of education for a two-year internship.

Deliberate efforts to change professions are becoming more common and more important as both middle class and poor clients become increasingly dissatisfied with such services as education, social welfare, health, and law. Evaluation of the Teacher Corps program can show the results of some change strategies employed in education, the forces that help and hinder efforts to change, and the effects of applying the different strategies in various combinations of circumstances.

How Did the Evaluation Come About?

In the fall of 1967, staff members of the National Education Association who believed an evaluation of the Teacher Corps could be valuable for those trying to improve the schools and the profession initiated a meeting of representatives of the NEA's Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards,* the Ford Foundation, and the Teacher Corps. All three groups were interested in the kind of information an evaluation of the Teacher Corps could provide and agreed that the study should be done. Because the Corps itself had no money budgeted for evaluation, the Foundation agreed to finance it. An independent advisory committee representing universities, public schools, and teacher organizations was appointed to guide the study; the Teacher Corps national staff agreed to cooperate and to refrain from trying to influ-

* The Commission has since been merged with other units into the NEA Programs in Instruction and Professional Development.

ence the results and from disseminating reports without permission; and a research team headed by Ronald Corwin was selected.

How Was the Study Conducted?

The Teacher Corps was recognized as a complex program. Local programs within the Corps varied a great deal. Even within local programs, various similar components differed and programs varied from year to year. Measuring inputs and narrow program outcomes hardly seemed possible; even if such an approach were possible it could hardly be justified because it would ignore the intervening conditions responsible for outcomes, i.e., the process. Only if process is fully understood can outcomes be improved or replicated in other settings.

Evaluating the Teacher Corps, then, was seen as a more difficult and complex task than setting up a controlled experiment with specific goals and measurable results. Whereas an experiment conducted under controlled conditions can produce results that are specific and tangible, the evaluation of a complex undertaking like the Teacher Corps would provide no simple verdicts. In fact, this study did not aim to determine how well the program as a whole achieved its goals nor to arrive at a categorical acceptance or rejection of the program as a whole. Put another way, this study did not set out to determine whether or not the Teacher Corps "worked." Rather, it attempted to determine in what respects and under what conditions different aspects of the program were more effective than other viable alternatives. The intent was not to catalog each component of the program, bit by bit, but to arrive at a grasp, and ultimately a qualitative assessment, of the overarching but variant patterns within and among the programs.

In addition to identifying some components of teacher education programs that seem to be relatively effective under specified conditions and some training models that are appropriate for various settings, objectives, and resources, one of the most important outcomes of the study is to suggest approaches to evaluating complex programs and to formulate questions that can be answered by research. These questions can be as significant as and ultimately more useful than the simple one, does the Teacher Corps work? They can have implications that extend beyond the immediate problems of the Teacher Corps and point toward ways of improving the profession.

What Were the Special Aims of the Study?

The special aims of the study were:

(1) To discover whether bringing Teacher Corps interns into a school changes relationships among teachers and between teachers and students

(2) To identify the distinctive changes that occur in different types of schools and universities and in different types of programs during Teacher Corps internship

(3) To discover changes in the interns' idea of their role during internship.

The study searched for signs of improvement that might have occurred because of the program, rather than attempting to determine how the program measured up to ideal standards. A *comparative model* of research was used, measuring Teacher Corps programs at different sites, one against the other, to see what strategies, program elements, and environments produced the greatest success. Also, a *variable testing* approach was used. The objective was to understand *how* the program produces whatever effects it has by identifying those elements of the program responsible for the effects that are (or are not) produced.

Tools for the study were not readily at hand. The team was able to draw parts of the questionnaires used from established tests to get at specific factors; other parts had to be specially formulated. The several questionnaires administered measured respondents' backgrounds, occupational intentions, attitudes toward teaching, attitudes toward racial minorities, opinions on the effectiveness of the various types of people involved in the local programs, political attitudes, opinions on different segments of the Teacher Corps program and their results, and feelings about the program as a whole.

From research studies on teaching effectiveness a composite picture* was developed of an ideal teacher for schools that serve poor children. Analyses were performed to discover whether the interns approximated

*Corwin, Ronald G., *Reformed Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973. pp. 79-80.

this ideal more closely than experienced teachers and what effect these ideal characteristics had on attempts to change the schools.

The team did not attempt to measure children's learning systematically. Such a goal would have been too great for the scope of the Teacher Corps study and, in any event, the results would have been suspect: interns were involved in the classroom in so many ways and in such varying degrees that the scores from different schools, or even from different classrooms, would not have been comparable.

The data were collected from 10 of 35 second- and third-cycle programs. The sites were deliberately chosen from among the better programs as rated by the national staff of the Teacher Corps: three were rated as *good*, three as *above-average*, and two *below-average* (none were selected from among those rated as poor). The programs were located in various parts of the country and represented both urban and rural areas. Four were connected with schools that had predominantly black student bodies; two involved Chicano or Indian children. At each site the study included at least three schools that were taking part in the Teacher Corps program and, for rough comparison, one that was not—42 schools in all among the 10 sites.

When the study began, in the fall of 1968, five of the ten programs involved were in the second cycle of Teacher Corps operation, which began in the fall of 1967 (each fall a new two-year cycle begins) and in their own second and final year of existence. The other five were third-cycle programs in their first year of operation; four of these were the first Teacher Corps programs to be conducted at their respective sites.

The study team visited all ten sites from October 1968 to March 1969, spending a week at each administering questionnaires, conducting interviews, and observing the program. A total of 1,293 individuals responded to the questionnaires—interns, teachers, and principals in participating schools, participating college faculty, and graduate students in education who were not in the Teacher Corps program; 932 of these persons were also interviewed personally.

The team revisited the five third-cycle programs in the spring of 1970, readministering the questionnaires to 305 persons to measure the difference a year had made in their responses. One member of the team spent twenty days observing and recording patterns of interaction and activities at four of these five sites. In addition, the team used official records, interviewers' field notes, and diaries kept by some of the interns.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How Is the Study Reported in This Document?*

The report which follows is a generalized version of the findings of the comprehensive study reported by Corwin in *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change.* Two kinds of information are woven together throughout the report:

(1) The generalized findings from the 10 Teacher Corps sites studied, and

(2) Illustrative material drawn from two different sites.

The latter is anecdotal information from a site labled *Urban* and a second site labled *Southern.* The sites differ in many ways. They represent more than an urban/rural contrast. There are more than community and regional differences. The idea is to portray a picture by actual examples of some of the information reported in the generalized findings, hoping that concrete illustrations convey a better sense of the way the actual sites studied operated.

What Was Southern University Like?

Southern University was located in a town of about 4,500. It enrolled about 1,500 students, almost all of them white. By usual standards, the university ranked low academically. Almost half the faculty of education thought of themselves as conservative; none as very liberal or radical. Nearly all the students in the schools participating in the pro-

It should be stressed that the information and conclusions in this report are drawn from the way the program was operating during the second and third cycles. Since that time, the program has continued to evolve and change. Recently, there has been reliance upon competency-based education, portal and multi-unit schools and computer-assisted management and control systems. Through these various plans the Teacher Corps has attempted to place more emphasis on the objective of institutional change, to break the barriers that separate educational authorities, to make team teaching a more viable and central part of the program, and to more clearly specify the roles of those involved, to give equal parity status to parents and community members, and to provide ongoing feedback and evaluation. While these seem to be commendable and promising developments, it is still too early to determine whether the obstacles that deflected the earlier plans can be surmounted through these changes.

gram were black; most were poor. The Teacher Corps staff also were nearly all black, whereas the superintendent and several principals were white. The teachers ranked low (eighth out of the ten sites studied) in the quality of the undergraduate colleges they attended (as measured by an index based on the college's resources and how selective its policies were). One team leader was replaced because of his "extremism"; half the interns considered his replacement incompetent. Both white team leaders considered themselves conservative; the black team leader considered himself "very liberal." The original program director resigned out of frustration, even before the actual internship began.

What Was Urban University Like?

The national Teacher Corps office judged the program at Urban University to be one of its best local programs. The university was the largest of the 10 institutions studied and was located in a poor neighborhood in a large cosmopolitan Eastern city. The college was known for leadership in improving ghetto education, and was operating six other training programs. The faculty was liberal, i.e., they ranked second in the proportion who considered themselves "very liberal." The teachers in the cooperating schools considered themselves moderately conservative and insistent on classroom discipline. Most belonged to a teacher union. A high proportion held master of arts degrees from relatively good schools. Like the teachers, most of the students were black, and more than half were quite poor. The principals were highly supportive of the program, and the teachers were highly loyal to the administration. One of Urban University's strongest features was its community involvement component, which many of the university faculty members supported strongly.

Together, these two programs illustrate many of the Teacher Corps' strengths and weaknesses.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

What Was Discovered in the College Experience?

College faculties generally didn't want basic change in their own institutions, although they sometimes wanted to see the schools change. The most common strategies they used to avoid basic change were to make minor *alterations* in existing programs or *add* to them. Both strategies made it less likely that fundamental changes would be required or that existing programs would have to give up funds or staff.

Most people involved in the programs agreed that college courses had been changed, usually by adding material about teaching the poor, especially racial minorities. However, only one person in six thought these courses had more than slight value, and even they usually conceded that fundamental changes in program had not been made. Probably for this reason three-fourths of the interns and others in the programs thought the coursework was the least relevant part of the internship. Although more than half the university faculty and program directors thought the preservice part of the internship was excellent, only one in six interns and team leaders thought so. Almost half the interns and university faculty, and a third of the teachers, said the coursework was the part of the program that should be reduced.

Interns were not satisfied with the university program for several reasons. The interns thought respecting and relating to students was more important than intellectual skills. According to college faculty members and team leaders, interns didn't learn (or weren't taught) teaching skills and, furthermore, were naive about what to change in the schools and how changes could be made.

More than half the interns and team leaders were dissatisfied with the college faculty's competence. The faculty was the group most frequently criticized, usually for lack of knowledge about poor people and racial minorities. In one course, students were asked only to clip articles from

Time Magazine on ghetto problems. In places where the poor speak a language other than English, the universities often didn't even teach the other language. Few of the interns rated even one of their college instructors as a superior teacher. The interns from the better undergraduate colleges were the most dissatisfied.

Because the interns thought their coursework was unrelated to the needs of students from low-income families, they tried to change the courses. Their basic strategy was to challenge the instructors. Some instructors said this made them think; others were simply distressed; others, defensive. One defense reaction was to label the interns as *hippies*, or to call them *rude*; once they were labeled, their professors no longer felt it necessary to take them seriously. But it was not entirely defensiveness. The interns sometimes tried to indoctrinate school children with a closed-minded liberal ideology unrelated to the subject matter. Interns also were regarded as anti-intellectuals who had no interest in studying. The interns countercharged that professors penalized those who openly disagreed with them.

There were two other sources of the interns' disappointment. One stemmed from the fact that interns expected more from the universities than from the public schools, since the former are generally considered more intellectually and socially responsible. Secondly, little was known about teaching in racially impacted poverty schools.

Southern University. A black intern at Southern University said, "I'm not sure that it's the university that's to blame. It may be a general problem. No one knows how to teach disadvantaged children."

The interns at Southern University were more dissatisfied with the college faculty than those in all but one of the other programs. Early in the internship they staged a mini-sit-in. They wanted courses that were less structured, more problem-oriented, and better coordinated with one another. They also wanted to help plan the courses. In addition, they wanted more individual independent reading, elimination of the thesis requirement, and a change in the timing of the general examinations.

Most of these interns thought the faculty were incompetent. "The course titles are great," one intern remarked, "but you need professors who know what they are talking about." Interns felt the gap between information and experience left them unprepared. "I don't think that

we are really trained in a scientific analysis of what is and what is not effective," said one. "We have enthusiasm and desire, but we aren't really prepared." Another agreed: "We know theories—we know what's happening, but we don't work on how to effect change in the local area." The college faculty found teaching the interns emotionally taxing although intellectually rewarding. The interns claimed that they were penalized for criticizing the faculty.

Urban University. In contrast, the interns at Urban University were more highly satisfied with the faculty than those at any other program. Even this program was far from placid, however. Curriculum professors said interns complained that "they stand up there and lecture us about how not to lecture to the kids." These interns also wanted to participate more in classes; the faculty, who had not been ready for such challenging and aggressive students, wished they were more tactful. Two-thirds of the interns thought the faculty penalized them for disagreement. A few, however, said their suggestions had been accepted and that some instructors had actually encouraged disagreement. Only a few professors were rated as superior teachers by most interns, but most of them were judged adequate, if capable of doing an even better job. "We do much to tax the teachers," said one intern. "Our standards are high. We don't give the teachers much leeway."

These interns wanted courses in the language of poor children, social change in the inner city, and teaching poor children. Yet they agreed that some courses were particularly helpful; for example, critical thinking, intergroup relations, children's literature, creative methods, Negro history, and methods courses in reading, math, and science. Although a quarter of them thought the coursework was the least important part of the program, they all agreed that it helped prepare them to teach.

What Was Discovered in the School Experience?

Friction between interns and school staff, like that between interns and university staff, arose in part from differences in definition of the interns' role. *Teachers wanted interns to be teaching assistants; interns wanted to be change agents.* Only one person in five from all the groups studied thought that change either in teaching or in the community was

among the primary goals of the local programs. Yet one of the basic premises behind the Teacher Corps concept is that interns can help their professors and cooperating teachers to change while they themselves learn. The interns resented the discrepancy between the announced and the actual goals.

The conflicts caused by differences in definition were widespread. More than half the principals and interns and a quarter of the teachers had disagreements, usually with team leaders. The team leaders themselves were in an important and difficult position; they were between several groups—interns, teachers, professors—able to commit each group on the spot to promises that others would be expected to carry out. They were usually considered competent, although many interns suspected that they had been selected for their loyalty to the school administration as well. Most, in fact, seemed to be moving through this assignment into administration, although at least a few were given the assignment because their principals wanted to get them out of the classroom. Their first loyalty was frequently to the school, and they tried to make sure the program served the school rather than the opposite. They resented any attempt to use the school as a clinic or as the interns' personal province.

The team leaders were in a good position to moderate between the interns and school staff, and they had plenty of opportunity to do so. Again, their attitudes and opinions were usually between those of the interns and the experienced teachers. The interns didn't rely on their team leaders to support them in their disputes; indeed, only a quarter of them thought they could count on any Teacher Corps administrator to back them when a worthwhile Teacher Corps activity got them in trouble. Conflicts involved the amount of time interns spent in the classroom, who could tell them what to do, their attitudes toward permissiveness and control of pupils and team leaders' resistance to their proposals. Teachers resented, for example, time interns spent outside the classroom because they considered the interns to be aides. Some interns also damaged teachers' authority by supporting pupils in disputes.

Conflicts were probably increased by teachers' resentment of the internship. Interns were able to move around the school more freely than the teachers, they had time off to attend their university classes, and they were getting paid to go to college, whereas many teachers had had to struggle to get their degrees. In one program, teachers demanded

and won equal time off for professional preparation while the interns taught their classes.

Southern University. Most of the problems that could plague the classroom aspects of the internship appeared in the program at Southern University.

(1) *The teachers suddenly found Northern white liberals in their classrooms without really knowing why.*

(2) *The interns were likely to have attended better colleges than the teachers, and the teachers felt their jobs were threatened.* This situation was not eased when one of the principals asked interns to give grades, thus undercutting teachers' authority.

(3) *The interns lacked experience teaching poor children, so the teachers couldn't easily accept their ideas.* There had just been student demonstrations, and here were the interns calling for change in the establishment—teachers were both alarmed and resentful.

The way the interns presented their ideas didn't help matters. For example:

(1) *Some of them insulted both principal and teachers.*

(2) *Some would teach only when the teacher was out of the room.*

(3) *Some argued with the teacher in class about what to teach and how.*

Teachers retaliated. For example: *Some asked the interns who had attacked their teaching and grading—or whose appearance they resented—to stop teaching.* In every school interns said four or five teachers had tried to create trouble for them; in one school they considered almost three-fourths of the teachers uncooperative. In every school, however, there were also one or two teachers who did cooperate.

The attitudes of principals ranged from hostility to mild neutrality—not surprising in view of their dependence on a jumpy white community. The interns had come with a purpose in mind—one resented by the community—and were determined to carry it out regardless of local conditions.

Both teachers and professors at Southern University limited the effect of the interns by using strategies that are in general use in our society.

(1) *They stigmatized the interns, calling them "hippies" or "troublemakers," so that they could comfortably dismiss their opinions and avoid comparison with them.* They got unexpected help in this from a psychologist who referred to interns who complained to Washington as *maladjusted.* Some teachers thought this meant *schizophrenic.*

(2) *Teachers and faculty isolated the interns.* At school they were assigned to self-contained classrooms or tutoring projects; at the university, to special courses. Group projects were discouraged, except for one concerning a Black History Week assembly for parents.

(3) *In one team, white males and black females were given separate assignments and told to stop visiting one another's homes.*

(4) *One cooperating teacher assigned interns to tutor students one at a time in the cafeteria rather than come into the classroom.*

(5) *One principal assigned the interns to clerical work.* Interns cut off from teachers sometimes became closer to their students, which created further friction with the resentful teachers.

Team leaders were another instrument of control. Principals called the two white ones "strong enough in their convictions to guide the Corpsmen instead of being misdirected by the more radical elements among them." One of them, whose husband was a local professional man, announced "I'm a conservative about race. I've lived around blacks all my life, but I've never taught them before." She thought the program was meant to establish better rapport between the races and teach black teachers to use school equipment. Interns believed that the team leaders had been assigned to control them. They charged that team leaders were afraid of black children and knew little about the black community, and didn't want anyone else to learn about it.

Finally, another strategy was to replace dissident participants. Seven interns dropped out the first year and eight university faculty members resigned. Interns in the next cycle were chosen to be less troublesome; they were undergraduates from the local area, and half were black.

When the interns were carrying out the role teachers wanted them to play, however, school staff gave them support and approval. There were no problems reported in a school served exclusively by Southern interns, and both teachers and principal praised the program. The interns arranged schedules, tutored, and helped teach slow learners; they had introduced cross-age tutoring of retarded youngsters by high

school students and started an art program the principal thought affected the whole school. At the beginning of the program only one intern believed its practical aim was to help teachers; by the end, half said so. In general, the teachers thought that although they wouldn't be exceptional teachers, the interns in this one school would be better prepared than most.

Urban University. Unlike those at Southern University, the teachers at Urban University didn't seem threatened by the interns. None of them reported that the program had caused them any problems personally, although they thought others might have either had trouble with interns or resented not having been assigned one to help them. They thought the interns were a great help as long as they stayed in the role of student teacher. They favored parts of the community activity program, such as home visits, which helped interns understand their students and create trust among parents. "Parents fear the Teacher Corps people less than they fear regular teachers. It breaks down the idea that parents are used to. . . thinking of teachers as being above them." The teachers considered the interns hardworking and concerned, although perhaps somewhat naive. Because they didn't feel threatened, they were generally cooperative and receptive. The only source of real friction between interns and teachers was discipline. Teachers thought the permissiveness of interns not only undermined their own classroom control but enabled the interns to become closer to their pupils than the teachers themselves could be. Teachers resented this but also considered it one reason there were fewer disciplinary problems when interns were present. The other reason they recognized was the reduction in pupil-adult ratio.

What Was Discovered in the Community Experience?

The university was responsible for coordinating the community activity component of the program. Interns and team leaders were to plan the projects and the school was to provide the time necessary and to be kept informed.

Fewer than a third of the university people, and only half as many school people, considered the community activity component excel-

lent. More than a quarter of the interns said it was unsatisfactory or nonexistent; most thought it less valuable than the teaching experience. Between a quarter and a third of university and school people said that if any part of the program was reduced, it should be the community work.

A possible reason for the dissatisfaction with community work was the amount of conflict it generated. Two conflicts were basic: social action (like voter registration) as opposed to social service (like work in health programs) and school-related activities (like work on a model cities project). Interns were likely to want to work for change in the community, whereas other people in the programs thought they should be getting to know their students better. The kinds of activity actually carried on constituted a complete range. The most common were after-school activities such as arts and crafts, clubs, and sports; home visits also were common. Less common were work in community agencies and organizations, tutoring in the community, and establishing parent education projects in anything from leadership to crafts. Interns also conducted community surveys and field trips for both parents and children; a few worked to register voters or in model cities programs.

When interns became involved in civil rights activities, the community was likely to demand that they be stopped. People responsible for the Teacher Corps program tried to satisfy the national guidelines in token ways that could improve public relations without giving the interns significant responsibility.

Structural problems also hampered community activities. At the end of each cycle, the activities were left to the parents and teachers remaining in the community and to new interns coming in. Each of these groups was likely to have other activities they considered more important. Furthermore, the university campuses were sufficiently remote that the professors could neither give adequate supervision nor relate the activities and the coursework to one another. Many interns thought the faculty weren't competent either to prepare them for the community work or to supervise it anyway. The interns themselves, on the other hand, were often naive.

In one rural Southwestern program, the teachers, most of whom spoke no Spanish, were trying to prepare their Indian and Chicano students for assimilation into Anglo society. Teachers and parents didn't feel comfortable in one another's territory. The interns changed the whole atmosphere of the school, introducing everything from

audiovisual materials to a newspaper and athletic teams. Yet they didn't work in the community or visit pupils' homes. Principals had selected only those interns who would be willing to forego community work. It is doubtful that interns in such a situation even learned anything about the subculture to which their students belonged.

Southern University. The community activities had far different implications in the South than in the Northern ghettos for which they were designed. At Southern University in a tense situation, both whites and blacks feared the results of community activities by white Northern liberals. Blacks had recently become politically active in the area. The university was said to have agreed with the school system to suspend all community activities; faculty who encouraged the activities were asked to resign. The interns, however, persisted. Embarrassingly, they went to black churches and cafes. One group presented a principal with recommendations for carrying out a court desegregation order. Another worked on a voter registration drive that produced one of the few black boards in the South. Both black and white parents objected to an after-school psychology class that included sex education: black schoolgirls were studying with white interns without supervision. Some black parents objected to a sex education course being taught by "free-thinking hippies." Interns were warned not to associate with a black teacher whose brother was a nationally known civil rights leader in the South. When the school and community tried to stop these activities, several of the interns wrote repeatedly to the Washington office urging that the program be carried out as proposed, or else terminated. The office responded that even without community activities, any program in that region was better than none.

Urban University. The community activities program at Urban University was equally controversial, for different reasons. The university faculty supported it strongly: it would help the interns understand their students and was also the only real way to bring about change, they felt. Also, they themselves would win recognition as contributors in a new philosophy of teacher training. Consequently, they strongly urged interns to take part in the activities. By the second cycle, everyone but the faculty complained that the interns were expected to be social workers as well as students and teacher aides. The call on their time and energy was too great. Furthermore, people said the faculty pushed

interns into particular activities of their own design, many of them irrelevant, rather than encouraging them to develop their own. Both interns and principals thought the activities should be closer to the school in order to help the interns learn about their own pupils. The interns attributed the bias towards community work to the fact that three of the professors had never taught school and didn't realize how peripheral community work is in comparison to classroom experience. The teachers also thought community work was being emphasized at the expense of the needed classroom experience, although they approved of interns working directly with their own pupils after school, at the school or in the community. Teachers, of course, got help from the interns whenever they were in the classroom, which may have affected their low opinion of the community activities. It was the team leaders, however, who seemed to be the strongest opponents of the community activities. All three mentioned disputes with the community coordinator, whose authority overlapped theirs. One of them summed up their position: "The job is to train interns to be teachers, not social workers."

What Was Learned About the Interns?

One premise of the Teacher Corps is that the education of poor children can be improved by recruiting people with backgrounds different from those of most teachers now in the profession. There is evidence that the interns who were enrolled in the program at the time of the study did differ from the typical teacher in several important ways.

A third of the interns had degrees in the social sciences, almost another third in other liberal arts. Fewer than three in one hundred had majored in education, although more than a third had taken education courses. Slightly more than half were male, and the same proportion came to the program from outside the region. About nine out of ten were white. About a third of the interns considered themselves politically liberal; only one in twenty-five highly conservative. About half the interns said they had entered the Teacher Corps in order to work with the poor or to improve education for the poor. A third wanted to get their master of arts degrees or to learn a profession. The Teacher Corps,

however, was not entirely responsible for attracting these new teachers into teaching. Out of every ten interns, four said they would have gone into teaching even without the Teacher Corps, and three of ten were uncertain.

On the Graduate Record Examination, the interns' average score was lower than that of all graduate students, but higher than that of graduate students enrolled in education. A quarter of the team leaders and nearly half the others questioned rated the interns overall as "excellent." College faculty members considered the interns brighter than average; a few said they were among the brightest in the college. Two-thirds of the teachers in cooperating schools thought the interns were a little more competent than other students preparing to teach.

The interns came from relatively affluent backgrounds. Slightly more than half had parents whose work was professional or managerial, whereas fewer than half of the other graduate education students surveyed came from this kind of background.

The teachers in the schools where the interns worked differed from interns in many respects. Only one in three of the new teachers and one in four of the experienced teachers came from professional or managerial backgrounds. Only one teacher in four was male, one in five was from outside the system, and two of three were white. Out of every five teachers, about one considered herself or himself politically liberal and one highly conservative.

How Did Interns Differ from Typical Teachers?

The two groups were compared against a composite "ideal teacher" drawn from the literature:

(1) *The two groups differed in their intentions to teach poor children.* Two-thirds of the interns and half the experienced teachers had worked with the poor before taking part in the Teacher Corps program. Three interns in a hundred, but nearly half the experienced teachers, preferred working in all or predominantly white schools. On the other hand, a little more than half the teachers, but only a third of the interns, expected to continue teaching indefinitely. The new teachers, however, were even less positive in their intentions than the interns—only a quarter of them expected to go on teaching. Nearly half the

interns expected to stay in education in some work other than teaching. Four out of five of the interns expected to teach in schools for poor children the following year. Two out of five expected to continue for five years, and a quarter of them expected to continue indefinitely. A report on the interns who graduated from the first cycle (1966-68) shows something about what interns actually do. The year after the cycle concluded, four out of five of the graduates were teaching. More than three out of five were teaching poor children. Another one in ten, although not teaching, was working in education. More than half the male graduates were working in elementary schools.

(2) *Nearly half of the interns favored school integration, either highly or moderately;* little more than a quarter of the experienced teachers did.

(3) *Interns were rated as relatively good teachers by team leaders and classroom teachers;* team leaders usually rated the interns higher than the teachers did. Interns were considered average in their community relations, but they received good ratings on their innovativeness, understanding of pupils, and rapport with pupils. The team leaders were rated by other teachers and by interns as good in understanding and rapport with pupils, average in innovativeness, and between average and below-average in community relations, and average or slightly above in the other three areas.

(4) *The interns were less submissive and more likely to take initiative than the experienced teachers.* The team leaders, who ranked between interns and experienced teachers on most measures, were more compliant than the teachers. Interns and teachers also differed greatly in both their degree of loyalty to the administration and the importance they attached to the endorsement of school rules and regulations. In each case, about four in ten of the teachers, but only one in ten of the interns, ranked on the upper third of the scale.

(5) *Although the majority of both teachers and interns agreed that the most important objective of the teacher was to teach basic skills, like reading and calculating, they differed in the priority they attached to other objectives.* A third of the interns, but less than a fifth of the teachers, thought that helping children do what they wanted to do should have first or second priority. About opposite proportions thought teaching children to respect the teacher's authority deserved priority. The interns also ranked higher than teachers on a measurement

of orientation to students; half the interns, but only a fourth of the teachers, expressed a high regard for the welfare of students. More than a third of the interns (compared to ten percent of the experienced teachers) also preferred not to exercise strict control over pupils.

(6) *Almost nine out of ten interns considered an ideal teacher to be one who encourages creative, independent thought;* only sixty percent of the experienced teachers agreed. Only about one in twenty interns said their ideal teacher was subject-matter-oriented; one in five experienced teachers upheld this ideal. Fewer than one in a hundred interns respected the disciplinarian teacher most, whereas nearly one out of five teachers did.

(7) *The interns were more likely than teachers to recommend that the structure of the society should be changed and educational opportunity improved as a way of combatting proverty.* They were less likely to recommend training in marketable skills or to blame poverty on the lack of drive on the part of poor people. Like teachers, they did, however, stress self-respect. Interns didn't consider job opportunity and guaranteed income as very promising ways to eliminate poverty.

A substantial majority of the interns, but little more than a third of teachers, disagreed strongly with the statement, "There are some groups in this country to whom you cannot teach anything." Nearly twice as high a proportion of interns as of teachers thought more than nine out of ten students could graduate from high school. The highest proportion of both interns and teachers thought that the learning difficulties encountered by poor children are caused by their home environments. More than a third of the teachers, however, placed the blame on the limited capacity of the child himself, whereas about half the interns thought the cause was failure of schools to prepare the child, and another third blamed the problems specifically on a poor curriculum.

(8) *Finally, by comparison with the teachers, interns were likely to be highly alienated—to feel they had little power.*

On most measures new teachers, like team leaders, ranked between interns and experienced teachers.

Black interns differed considerably from whites in many ways. A lower proportion of blacks than of whites thought integration would improve the academic achievement of all concerned; a higher proportion would not sacrifice neighborhood schools for integration. The blacks also were less permissive toward students. Twice as many blacks

as whites ranked low in orientation toward students, and half as many ranked low in strict discipline. This attitude is consistent with the attitude that seems to be common among black parents that their children need to learn all they can if they are to survive in a white-dominated society. Many of these parents encourage the use of fair but strict discipline to keep their children learning. Black interns were thus less concerned than others with making the schools more "humane" by white liberal standards. They were also more committed to careers in education, to teaching, and to teaching in schools that serve poor children. Almost as many whites as blacks expected to teach the following year, but about twice as many blacks as whites expected to be teaching in five years and indefinitely.

The attitudes of the interns tended to cluster in predictable ways, in addition to these racial differences. Politically liberal interns were likely to favor integration and to be child-oriented and permissive. They tended to take the initiative and not to put much emphasis on enforcing school rules or to be very loyal to the school administration. They were also often alienated from the Teacher Corps itself and not very committed to teaching.

Graduates of teacher training institutions were three times as likely as other teachers to prefer working in predominantly white schools. To this extent, the program's effort to attract recruits from outside the usual sources of teachers justifies its assumption that they would be more liberal. The stress on recruiting liberal arts graduates, however, didn't make much difference in interns' commitment to teaching; evidently, the program attracted the same kind of people, whatever their major had been—moderates from liberal arts and liberals from elsewhere. It is worth noting that the interns attracted into teaching by the program—i.e., who said they would not otherwise have gone into teaching—were less committed to teaching and more politically conservative than interns who planned to go into teaching even if the program had not been available.

Interns at Southern University. In each local program the interns had distinctive characteristics. Six of the twenty-seven interns at Southern University, for example, came from the North. Four out of five were white males. More than half had majored in liberal arts, half of these in a social science. They differed from the teachers, in status, race, sex, and level and quality of education, more widely than the interns in any

other program. Compared to interns in the other programs, however, these interns expressed a relatively high degree of loyalty to the administration, although they were far less loyal than the teachers; they expressed relatively low liberalism but were far above the teachers. Those teachers, in fact, were the lowest in all ten programs in their advocacy of integration.

Three times as many interns as teachers thought it was all right for them to demonstrate for unpopular causes. About a third of these interns had joined the Teacher Corps because of interest in civil rights. One said that "unless something is done in this country about the nation's poor, we will have massive unrest. I've come to realize how necessary it is to reach people down at the lower level before they drop out. Social revolution is a real possibility." An alliance of Northerners and social scientists took form, distinct from the Southerners and those who had backgrounds in education. Most of the blacks were in this latter group, whose members had joined the Corps primarily to get a master of arts degree.

Interns at Urban University. Six of the twenty interns at Urban University came from outside the region. Five were black; only eight were males. The interns ranked highest, and the teachers sixth, among the ten programs in the quality of their undergraduate college, but there was little overall difference in status between these teachers and interns. Half the members of each group exhibited a high degree of loyalty to the school administration; half the interns and not quite a third of the teachers considered themselves to be very liberal or radical. Most of the interns had joined the Corps in order to try out teaching as a career—some specifically teaching the poor—or to get a masters degree. Fifteen were moderately and one highly committed to teaching.

The characteristics of the interns in the ten programs studied fairly closely matched many of those of the composite ideal teacher. On more than half the variables the interns' scores closely approximated the ideal, but the teachers' scores matched only a third of them. Interns in the five second-year programs were studied more closely. In each of these programs the interns approximated the ideal teacher (measured as the sum of eight variables) more closely than experienced teachers, followed by the new teachers and team leaders. Although team leaders occupied an intermediate position on six of the variables, they ranked very low in attitude toward racial integration and professional orientation.

What Were the Program Outcomes?

The outcomes of the Teacher Corps were hammered out by the teams as they worked in the schools and colleges. Consequently, each program varied depending upon the individuals involved and the structures in which they worked. The school and college staffs, like the interns, tried to shape the program to serve their own needs. Their needs ranged from help in the classroom and preservation of the present structure in the case of schools to creation of a new social structure, which some professors wanted to see the schools adopt. Conflict caused by incompatibility of goals kept the program from doing what any one group wanted it to do, although it served each group to a certain extent.

Change in Schools

Whether the Teacher Corps had improved curriculum was a topic of disagreement, both within and among the different programs. Most of the people in the study did agree that the Corps had made at least a temporary change in classroom technique. Most people said they'd seen interns using new methods, which seemed to be working; *they thought the Teacher Corps had at any rate helped bring some new techniques into at least one school in each program.* Some of the changes the Corps brought about were *tutoring of younger pupils by older ones, art programs, PTA's, Boy Scout troops, trips, more use of audiovisual equipment, school newspapers, black history and culture courses, and greater interest in school and learning for some students.* But more typically, the people who said the Teacher Corps had helped the schools were talking about work load, not innovation. Many of those who participated in the study mentioned the difference it made to have another person in the classroom, mostly in terms of individual attention. Most people agreed that having the interns there had made special education classes possible. The results aren't surprising—before the program, only one person in four or five had expected it to introduce new methods or materials; only one in six expected change in structure or in relations with the community.

Despite lack of concrete evidence that the school would be a different kind of place, there was fairly widespread agreement that the attitudes of many people associated with it had improved during the program. *Most of the teachers said their own attitudes toward teaching and their pupils had improved, and a third of them said they had new ideas or worked harder. Moreover, study participants generally agreed that some children were learning more—including children who did not have direct contact with the interns.* One out of every two or three, including most principals, thought the children had better attitudes toward school because of the program. *About half the principals also thought discipline problems were reduced, but most interns and teachers thought not.*

Most of the university people reported that the schools were more involved with the community, but only a fourth of them had actually seen some concrete improvement. The other groups in the study were about evenly divided about this; they also disagreed about the usefulness of the community activities. More than half the Teacher Corps administrators and principals, but less than half the teachers and interns, said that the program had influenced teachers outside the program to become interested in the community and that the school itself was communicating more with the community.

One principal in four and one teacher in eight reported that the program had made difficulties for them. Fewer reported that it had created problems with the community or increased their work load.

School Change at Southern University. The interns in this program were pessimistic about change: only one in ten thought the program would have a lasting effect. Nevertheless, half the teachers and principals thought the program had achieved lasting changes. The two groups may have been thinking about different kinds of change. The interns were disappointed in the lack of institutional change, whereas the teachers were considering the fact that a few students had been helped by the program. In addition, there were subtle influences on the teaching role that perhaps neither group was fully aware of. The opinions of school staff and interns placed the program seventh among the ten studied in number of innovations and improvement of children's motivation and performance, eighth in number of community projects. One intern said, "This school has shown very little commitment to either the goal or guidelines of the Teacher Corps. It is spending a great deal

of money for too little an effect." Only one intern thought he'd learned much from a team leader about teaching; only one intern in five said he'd learned something from a cooperating teacher.

Yet, a few interns thought the little that had been accomplished was better than nothing. Even those who thought they hadn't affected the system agreed with the teachers that they might have helped a few individual students. Some students could express themselves better, and some found the classes taught by interns the most interesting. The interns evidently helped the slow students with basic skills and encouraged the gifted to go to college. One student who hadn't been able to read became a sportswriter for the school paper. Moreover, interns' refusal to use corporal punishment gave students a new perspective on teachers. The children had a chance to see men teaching and to observe different ways of talking and academic values that differed from those of the region. Interns also gave the pupils a chance to work with whites. The six interns on one team were many more whites than had ever been in that school before. Students not only got used to turning to the interns but also began talking more freely to the white counselors. Interns took black children to restaurants and other places the children had thought they couldn't go. They went to basketball games with them. The other school staff didn't like these activities—they thought the interns were trying too hard to "get down to the children's level" and that this would damage not only the interns' prestige but their own. A teacher and principal gave a lecture on morals to a black girl who had worked with a white intern on after-school tutorials.

The teachers in the school staffed by interns from the South thought they had done an especially good job. Children came to school more often, and they were more interested because the classes were smaller. A few children were doing better work, and the interns were useful and interesting to have around. Teachers in the other schools also agreed that a few children were more interested in school. They even conceded that there had been some temporary changes in the materials and methods used in the schools and that some of these changes were worth while, even if superficial. Principals reported only that the increased staff had made tutoring possible.

The interns had, in fact, started a lot of new activities in the schools—a PTA, a Boy Scout troop, more tutoring, more trips, more use of audiovisual materials and supplementary books, and a new grading system. Because interns were willing to grade papers, teachers could

assign more written work. Interns also encouraged students to put pressure on the mayor to repair some of the roads. In just one school they started a newspaper, an art program, a reading room, and a literary club; reportedly, two students there got university scholarships because of tutoring and other efforts by the interns. The teachers in the school who had resisted the program strongly eventually adapted to innovations they had considered radical—older students tutoring younger ones, free hours for students' leisure reading, a course in black history and literature, and an African dance troupe. The interns borrowed equipment from the university so they could use more films on black history and literature, and coordinated the separate history and literature courses so that they reinforced one another.

Although the teachers were very defensive toward the interns, all this activity was bound to give them some ideas of their own about ways to improve the schools. Even one principal who resented the interns because they looked down on the teachers said they were needed to stop the educational stagnation in the area.

School Change at Urban University. The school staff and interns rated the program at Urban University only sixth among the ten universities studied in improvement of children's motivation and performance but second in both number of new techniques and new community projects. The interns reported they had introduced at least procedural, if not substantive, changes; the teachers, however, maintained that they themselves had introduced many of these changes on their own.

Whoever began it, children were learning mathematics through a game. They were learning to read and write by writing stories about things they'd done and reading them to the class. Classes were divided into small groups, according to the children's achievement level, to do work suitable for that level. The teachers said this increased pupils' attention span and allowed them to give the pupils more individual attention. The teachers also liked using the inquiry approach in science and social studies, which bases children's learning on their own questions and research. They thought the children got more interested, too, when they helped plan the coursework.

Some teachers also said they had seen evidence that pupils were more interested in school, that they came to school more often, and that

discipline problems had decreased. They thought the major reason for this was the presence of a second adult in the classroom; some suggested, too, that to see adults cooperating encouraged the children to cooperate with one another. Children who had been withdrawn became more outgoing—probably, again, partly because they got more individual attention and partly because of the open, cooperative atmosphere. Some teachers did feel that the interns allowed students to get wild and out of hand. One team, on the other hand, had a teacher removed for excessive use of corporal punishment. Some of the interns felt the teachers became less antagonistic toward informal class situations as time passed.

A few teachers said the interns were one of the first groups of whites whom the black teachers and pupils regarded as sincere. Working with them seemed to make some pupils think better of themselves.

The interns overcame some of their initial reservations about working on a variety of community activities. The ones who were most enthusiastic about the community work were those who had developed their own projects, although they sometimes followed suggestions of other Teacher Corps personnel. Most of the interns worked on established community programs. Some worked with a group that advised people about their housing rights and helped them find housing. Some worked with the United Veterans for Freedom Center, helping children solve personal problems and encouraging them to stay off the streets. Several worked at health centers and community centers. Some worked in adult evening classes. And a few worked on the Model Cities Area-Wide Council, which helped set up programs for the community. One team helped organize a buying club, licensed by the state, so that parents could buy food at wholesale prices. This co-op seemed to flourish, although the interns were afraid it wouldn't survive their departure. The interns also thought the community needed more all-night pharmacies and public transportation, and more doctors. They organized a bookmobile and helped set up Spanish sewing classes in a Puerto Rican neighborhood. They also sought out the children, taking them to the library or to dances. They provided tutoring in the children's homes and at the YMCA.

The university faculty considered it important for the interns to work at the YMCA and to attend board of education meetings. They also encouraged the interns to inform parents what community services were available to them; most interns talked with several parents a week

about such matters. The priority to be given home visits was the source of greatest friction in the community component of the program. One team suggested the teachers in their school should visit pupils at home more often; the teachers refused outright. They didn't have time, they said, and it wasn't their job anyway. The interns in the program, on the contrary, thought the home visits should be increased, because they helped interns learn about their pupils and the community and encouraged parents to help their children learn.

Cause of School Change. Introducing the interns into the schools and colleges produced both expected and unexpected results. One main premise of the Teacher Corps has been that bringing in people with a very different outlook would cause teachers and principals to adopt new positions nearer the newcomers. In fact, the greater the difference between interns and teachers in social attitudes or in status, the less change took place. The interns aroused defensive reactions from teachers and professors, yet they themselves had neither the numbers nor the authoritative position to overcome those reactions. The college faculty were too remote to give them effective support in the schools. Because the interns had no skills in introducing change, their only tactic was confrontation.

Indeed, the more interns in a program who had graduated from liberal arts colleges, and the greater the difference in the liberalism of teachers and interns, the fewer changes in educational techniques that took place and the more conflicts and problems that were reported. Also, there was less change the greater the difference in status (measured by race, sex, and education) between teachers and interns, the more politically liberal and favorable to change the interns were, the greater the proportion of males on the teams, and the more inclined the interns were to take initiative. A school's resistance to change, in short, was determined less by the characteristics of its own staff than by those of the interns. The more liberal and aggressive the interns were, the more inflexible the school became. The school's resistance to change also increased with interns' emphasis on creativity in teaching, quality of undergraduate college attended, and previous Peace Corps or VISTA experience.

Characteristics of the schools themselves that seemed to encourage change were the liberalism of the team leader, the proportion of teachers who were members of teacher organizations, and the quality of

teachers' undergraduate colleges. Teachers who had the security of being well educated and belonging to a supportive organization were probably less defensive about changes and were able to examine them on their merits. The competence of the principals, as rated by teachers and interns, seemed to minimize the amount of change; possibly their schools were less in need of improvement.

Several characteristics of the universities affected the amount of change in schools. The most important was the interns' satisfaction with the faculty's competence. The proportion of the faculty who considered themselves very liberal also made a difference. On the other hand, there was less change in schools associated with higher quality colleges and with colleges with several other teacher training programs. Possibly changes were being made already so that the Teacher Corps made little difference, or perhaps the different training programs were competing for money and staff attention.

The structure of the local program also seemed to make a difference. More change occurred where there was more money per intern, but even more important, it depended upon who controlled the money. The greater the proportion of funds controlled by the schools, the fewer changes that took place. Furthermore, there was less change where more teachers took part in writing the proposal for the program. The schools and the teachers seemed to be less interested in self-improvement or teacher education than in getting some help in the classroom; the more power they had over the program, the more it served this purpose.

Characteristics of the locality were a final influence on change in the schools. Urbanization and modernization were measured in each locality by the size of the community and such standards as proportion of non-farm workers and number of telephones per household, and checked against the different amounts of change that occurred. Schools in the large modern cities changed the most. In these schools, the school administration is more likely to be centralized and many of the teachers probably belonged to a strong teacher organization and were well educated and articulate.

While these schools were generally the most receptive to new ideas, they also were evidently better able to resist unwelcome pressure from the more aggressive interns: the amount of change in these schools was decreased by the proportion of interns who had liberal arts degrees.

Conversely, the rural schools changed the least; the most change

occurring where the proportion of aggressive liberal arts majors was highest. The rural schools in the less modernized regions had fewer defenses against outside pressure exerted by the interns. These schools were decentralized and could not rely on a strong central office to defend them. The teacher organizations were not strong, and the teachers themselves were less well trained.

Principals in the rural schools, who had more influence than those in the urban schools, supported the program less than those elsewhere, and they were more likely to think the main purpose of the program was to provide help in the schools. The teachers were relatively conservative. They were unusually loyal to the principals and thought it was very important to uphold school rules. They were politically conservative as well, not very well educated, and had a low rate of turnover. Their schools were well insulated from forces outside the region, such as federal policies. Thus, it is ironic that when the well-educated, politically liberal interns from outside the region appeared in their schools, the teachers in these schools reacted more defensively than teachers elsewhere; but they were more vulnerable to the interns than were teachers elsewhere. There was little change in these schools, but what change there was seems to have been caused by the liberal interns, without support from other factors.

Characteristics of both the schools and the colleges affected the community projects. The number of community projects increased with the proportion of liberal university faculty members and the number of training programs at the college. They also increased with the competence of the team leader and the number of teachers with master of arts degrees. The projects decreased, however, the more frequently teachers supported a teacher organization or had helped plan the local program. Evidently, professors who favored community work and had some experience were able to give effective help; teachers tried to keep the projects from interfering with classwork.

The community projects also were influenced by several of the interns' attributes. The greater the interns' emphasis on pupil control, the more community projects there were; the more interns who came from a liberal arts or Peace Corps or VISTA background, the fewer there were. This perhaps indicates that interns were freer to initiate community projects when they shared the teachers' values and did not deviate from the teachers' backgrounds; they were less likely to try radical or controversial experiments.

Change in the University

About half the college faculty studied said there had been change in classroom techniques during the program; but nearly as many said there had been no significant change. Again, this reflects variations in the rate of change in the different programs as well as different definitions of change. Many reported that professors had been awakened to the problems of the poor and racial minorities, and that they had become more receptive to open discussion in their classrooms. Two-thirds of the university personnel said new courses were offered, usually in subjects such as black history. A quarter said they themselves had introduced new courses, especially for the Teacher Corps program; many of these were offered cooperatively by more than one department. A quarter also said existing courses had become less abstract and that the faculty had gone to the schools and community in order to make them so. More than two-thirds of the faculty, in fact, said they had changed either the content of their courses or their way of teaching; some professors were making conscious efforts to do so. More than half of the professors and nearly three students in four said students and professors were communicating more. Some of the professors, however, had become defensive.

Three out of four faculty members said they had begun visiting the local schools, but usually they went only to observe students or to consult with teachers. None of them were holding classes at the school. A few of the teachers had part-time appointments at the university, but these were nominal. No more than half the faculty, about a third of the principals, and only a sixth of the teachers said relations between the school and college had improved.

University Change at Southern University. Southern University was fifth among the ten programs in both amount of change in the university and cooperation between school and university. A quarter of the faculty said there had been no change at all. Interns said the classes were not related to teaching the disadvantaged—often only the course titles had been changed. The faculty didn't have anything to tell them about teaching the poor black children in the community, and they were opposed to social change anyway. Many of these professors were established residents, whose wives or husbands worked in the town.

Many faculty members, however, maintained that change had occurred, and most of those said there had been a lasting effect even outside the Teacher Corps program. They reported that they themselves had learned about the problems of the local schools, and that the university showed more interest in the problems of the disadvantaged. For the first time, field work in the schools was required. Two professors out of three said they had changed the content of their courses or the way they taught. Some of the changes in existing courses were more reading, more observation of local schools, and more discussion of controversial issues. Only two new courses were actually added, however, one in black history and literature and a psychology course on teaching the disadvantaged. Requirements in sociology and reading were established, and a minor in sociology was created. A materials center was established for the program, and the faculty center acquired more videotapes; both of these were used more and more. Stimulated by the program, the arts and sciences faculty started a national science program for high school teachers.

The Teacher Corps was the occasion of more contact between the university and schools, but there was little structural change in their relationship. The few teachers with college appointments were mainly responsible for observing interns, and none were teaching university courses for credit. In some ways, the university's external relationships were damaged by the program. Townspeople resented the increasing number of black students the Corps brought to the university, and there were phone calls to the administration about the fraternization between black and white interns.

The Teacher Corps' greatest effect on Southern University was probably the presence of brighter, more aggressive students than usual. One professor said the interns had acted the way college students should act. Another said that even though he resented their disrespect, teaching them was the most rewarding experience in his career. Professors from outside the college of education were especially impressed with the interns, and the librarian said the interns used the library more than all the other students put together.

This difference in students evidently had its effect. The instructors weren't accustomed to hearing their ideas challenged by the traditional students with undergraduate degrees in education. The most demanding interns, they pointed out, were also the least experienced and most radical. One professor, who had always thought she was a good teacher

for the undergraduates--poor, rural, and disadvantaged--was shaken by the encounter. She said the interns baffled her so much she couldn't teach: "It's been a radical education for me. I'll never be the same. They argued about any and every point. I represented the establishment, and I guess they didn't like me. . .it was horrible." Five or six said the interns' impatience and lack of respect frustrated their attempts to teach and the interns' assertiveness threatened their authority.

Other instructors were able to put the experience to use with less pain. They said the interns made them less comfortable with their traditional ways, and they reportedly grew more willing to listen to the interns' points of view. Eight out of ten interns and seven out of ten professors said communication had improved. Most interns thought there was more room for disagreement because they had pushed the professors. There were also more student-dominated class discussions, more independent study, and more self-evaluation by both students and faculty. One professor who had not changed his course content said that the interns were asking more relevant questions and he was at least teaching it differently. Another was pleased that "they always wanted to know how to apply the things I was talking about." A third was able to see his class from a new viewpoint: "I suddenly understood that I was talking about only middle-class values in my courses."

University Change at Urban University. Urban University ranked second among the ten universities studied in the amount of change it experienced; it reported the highest degree of cooperation between school and university. Most of the faculty agreed that changes had occurred, although many doubted they would endure beyond the program. The program director was sure that everything except possibly the student financial aid was built in and would remain--even be extended to the undergraduate level. Another faculty member, however, thought nothing at all would be retained; a third, that the program would gradually be squeezed out. Others anticipated that the university faculty would absorb the Teacher Corps staff.

Some professors said they had changed the content of their courses and their way of teaching; others said their attitudes toward the poor and racial minorities had changed. New courses had been offered, and students in regular teaching programs were taking some of them--intergroup relations, for example. Some of the new courses, in fact, were

being taught to all liberal arts majors. Two schools were being set up, to be staffed almost entirely by the Teacher Corps graduates and interns. Some professors said their experience with the program had created a demand for them as consultants in educating the disadvantaged.

Not all the faculty were enthusiastic. Some were so rattled by the interns' aggressiveness that they asserted they'd never participate in the Teacher Corps program again. Two, whom the interns had given a lot of trouble, were especially negative: because the program had been disseminated through the university system, they maintained, it caused no real change in the schools. Even the most skeptical instructors, however, said they were re-examining their teaching in light of the interns' opinions. Some asked interns to help them improve their courses.

Causes of University Change. The strategy of substituting a new kind of people was evidently more effective in the universities than in the schools, for as the proportion of interns who had liberal arts degrees increased, so did the amount of change in colleges. Simultaneously, however, the proportion of liberal arts majors seemed to reduce the amount of cooperation between the schools and the college. The greater the status difference between teachers and interns, the higher the quality of the interns' undergraduate colleges, the less cooperation occurred. The characteristic that increased cooperation most was the amount of importance interns placed on classroom discipline.

Several characteristics of the university itself also affected the amount it changed. The number of changes increased with the proportion of faculty members who considered themselves very liberal; the other most important factor was the proportion of the grant the university controlled. When the schools controlled more of the money, change was reduced, not only in the schools, but in the university. The number of changes that took place increased with the number of training programs in the university but declined with the university's quality (measured by its resources and its selectivity).

Like change in the university, cooperation between the university and the schools decreased as the quality of the university increased. The factors that seemed to increase cooperation most were the faculty's competence as evaluated by the interns, and the liberalism of the team leader. Difference in liberalism between interns and teachers reduced this, as it did several of the other kinds of change.

Changes in Interns

The effects of the program on the 125 interns in the five new third-cycle programs were studied in site visits at the beginning and near the end of the internship. About a fourth of the interns dropped out. Women and social science majors were especially vulnerable, whereas people who had been in VISTA or the Peace Corps tended to remain. The interns who dropped out had been among those who wanted very much to help children. They were among the interns most disposed to take the initiative against the administration, and they were alienated from the Teacher Corps all along. As time passed, they became radicalized and more disillusioned with the teachers' role, and less committed to teaching.

The seventy-two interns who remained in these five programs changed too. Although a few developed more loyalty and commitment, most became more alienated from the local schools and the Teacher Corps, lost respect for teachers, and became less committed to teaching. At the end of the program, twice as many as before believed that the real aim of the Teacher Corps was to help local schools and help interns learn some teaching skills. Meanwhile, twice as many team leaders and teachers came to believe that the real goal was to help interns try out ideas, and fewer thought it was to acquaint the interns with poor children.

Some interns became disillusioned with the children as well as with schools and programs. Nearly half became less concerned with students; almost as many, however, expressed increased concern. Most came to give less importance to discipline, but in two of the programs, most came to believe it was more important than they had thought.

At the end of the program, more than half the interns considered themselves liberal or radical, twice as many as at the beginning. In two programs, however, the interns became more conservative, and nearly half the interns said they would now act more cautiously in conflicts with the administration. Nearly half came to favor integration more strongly, but almost as many thought it was less desirable than they had at first.

First- and second-year interns and new and experienced teachers all were sharply distinguished from one another. One cause of the difference between the two groups of interns might be that different kinds

of people had joined in different years, or that the programs were different in the two cycles.

The differences among all four groups, however, suggest that the interns who remained in the program were being socialized into the profession—changing their attitudes to more nearly conform to those of their professional elders. As they gained experience in the teaching profession, it seems, they became less concerned about students, less liberal, less likely to take initiative. They became more loyal to the administration and more concerned about controlling pupils and enforcing school rules. Interns who were alienated from the schools tended to drop out after internship or the first few years of teaching. Those who are left either continued to be radicalized and perhaps reached the point of dropping out at a later stage, or else became enough like the experienced teachers to stay in the profession.

Change in Interns at Southern University. The Teacher Corps program disillusioned the interns at Southern University. They had expected a community-centered curriculum oriented to local poor black children, but—"We haven't really done anything," said one intern. "I don't feel I've learned anything. I expected we would really get involved and really make some changes, and I expected to learn more from the courses I'm taking." Many interns lost faith in their pupils because they couldn't manage the homework and didn't ask questions. Two out of three interns expressed less concern for students during the program, whereas only one in four expressed more concern. Half the interns also became less convinced that schools should be integrated, and a few changed their personal preference for a job assignment from equally mixed to predominantly white schools.

Three interns out of four became less committed to teaching and decided not to make it a career; a few became more committed. Some, including the most idealistic, regarded the experience as temporary. Others who would have liked to go on working in the schools where they were couldn't get a job offer, partly because of a job shortage and partly because the schools didn't want liberal Northerners as teachers.

Almost half the interns grew more alienated from the schools, and even more became alienated from the Teacher Corps. All of them became less loyal to the school administration, and most attached less importance to enforcing school rules and classroom discipline. Nearly a third of them, conversely, came to put more stress on discipline.

Eight out of ten interns came to attach less importance to the opinions of other teachers and grew less convinced that teachers should make more of the decisions in the schools. Two-thirds became more convinced that teaching competence must be based on knowledge. At the beginning of the program, almost all had said their ideal teacher was one who tries to make classwork interesting and encourages creativity and independent thought; at the end, nearly half had changed to something else.

Nearly half those who had considered themselves fairly liberal became quite conservative during the program, whereas most of the interns in the five programs taken together had become more liberal. About a fourth of the interns at Southern became more liberal, however, and about half of those who had been very liberal became radical. Similarly, half the interns became more compliant, but another third became more likely to take the initiative against the administration. One intern said he had joined because he wanted to put his idealism into action: "I used to believe in changing things from within the system. But I haven't seen anything changed here in two years. Now I don't believe anything can be changed within the system down here."

Change in Interns at Urban University. None of the thirteen interns interviewed at Urban University said the Teacher Corps program had met his expectations; probably, said some, the expectations had been too high. Although their general preparation was adequate, they needed more concrete ways of handling discipline problems. Some thought classroom experience had been slighted in favor of community work. Seven out of ten, however, planned to teach in schools serving poor children. Most of them thought they were better prepared than most graduate students; almost all felt adequately prepared. Many believed they would be able to function as change agents.

Urban University, Southern University: Forces Affecting Change

The forces and events at the two universities described—both those that were alike and those that were different—show some things about how change is created or thwarted.

The settings of the two programs were quite different. In the area of Southern University, blacks were very poor and had no power; they were just beginning to organize to challenge their subjugation to a conservative and traditional white population. Both blacks and whites doubted that either school reform or special programs to serve blacks were good ideas. In the Urban University area, blacks already had political power; it was generally accepted that the black community should have better schools.

The differences between the two faculties and school staffs were consistent with the sociological and political situations in each setting. Southern University applied for a program because it needed money; the faculty weren't committed to achieving the Teacher Corps' change goal. At Urban, several training programs for educating the poor and racial minorities were already established; the faculty was interested and was establishing a reputation on its leadership in this field. Both of the school systems had authoritarian administrations. The schools at Urban were more centralized and better, however, and the teachers were less conservative than those at Southern, although they were hardly radical. University personnel had initiated both programs without involving teachers in planning. A larger number of college faculty helped plan the proposal at Urban, however, and the teachers were more thoroughly informed about the program before the interns actually appeared in the schools. The principals involved in the Urban program were more competent than those at Southern, and they supported the program a great deal more heartily.

The interns in the two programs also differed from each other. The group at Southern University included more males, more liberal arts graduates, more whites, more who were very liberal, and more who came from outside the region than the group at Urban. The interns at Urban, on the other hand, were more committed to teaching in schools serving poor children. Both groups clashed with the university faculty about instruction they considered authoritarian, unrelated to reality experience, and irrelevant to their specialized training. At Urban University, however, the interns had more faith in the ability of the faculty to improve their competence; furthermore, because the interns were less radical, the clashes were less disruptive.

In both programs, the community activities caused the most trouble, but the causes of the trouble were quite different. At Southern University, powerful community figures and university administrators

opposed any projects they thought might lead to social change and eventually strangled every activity that threatened them. At Urban, the interns and teachers felt the university staff had committed too much of the interns' time outside the classroom. The interns, being more committed to teaching, put a higher value on classroom experience, although they and the teachers agreed that home visits, too, were valuable to them, provided they could find the time. It was the faculty at Urban that was most interested in using the program to improve the community. More change could take place in the schools at Urban because the interns were less threatening to the well-educated and highly organized teachers in this bureaucratized system. The teachers at Urban reported that the program had caused them fewer problems and there were fewer conflicts among the Teacher Corps personnel. Because of their commitment to teaching, the interns in the program were content to accept the authority of the teachers and team leaders to a certain extent. The teachers, in turn, felt secure enough to listen to the interns' ideas and accept them often enough so the interns didn't feel their efforts at change were completely fruitless.

In sum, the changes that took place during the Urban University program were produced by the teachers, interns, and university faculty working together. The interns were incapable of forcing change by themselves; in any event, because they were committed to teaching as a career, they were disinclined to use confrontation tactics which implied risks. They were seriously outmatched by the competent and well-organized teachers. On the other hand, what changes there were at Southern were imposed on the schools by the interns singlehandedly. Although the faculty, the dominant community, the school teachers, and the principals opposed change, the interns had higher status than the teachers; they were willing to take risks because they weren't committed to a teaching career, and they drew support from outside the region. Thus the interns made more change at Southern, where no other force favored it; but more change occurred at Urban, where the interns were just one of several factors working together.

CONCLUSIONS

There are several reasons why it is not easy, perhaps not even advisable, to arrive at a categorical conclusion about the effectiveness of the Teacher Corps program. First, there were variations in the degree to which the program as planned was actually implemented. Second, the program, even as planned, was attempting to achieve multiple goals that were in partial conflict with one another. Third, the obstacles confronted by the program were exacerbated by the Congress itself, in particular the low funding levels, funding delays, continued controversy about program goals, struggles for control over the program, changed signals, and decentralization of control after the program was launched. Often, as an outcome of the lack of firm control, local schools and colleges were able to co-opt the program in the service of their own limited purposes. These problems were further aggravated because the responsible government agency was paralyzed by congressional indecision, local resistance, and the federal bureaucracy. The immediate strategies that the agency often adopted frequently compounded these problems and produced still others.

Some of these problems might have been circumvented if Congress had been willing and able to make systematic reviews of the progress of the program and to formulate the appropriate legislation at crucial turning points. *Indeed, the prospects for implementing effective categorical programs of this type in the future would be enhanced if the Congress were to take steps in advance to assure that the following conditions are met:*

- There is a broad base of support for the program;
- Program plans are in some measure derived from accepted organizational principles and a consistent and explicit strategy for change has been developed
- Adequate funding levels are not only authorized but are appropriated from the outset

- The administering agency is given adequate authority to enforce guidelines
- The necessary competent manpower is available at all levels of the program and provision is made for recruiting people who support the idea of the program and, concurrently, for permitting participants to exclude themselves
- Specific standards and criteria of competence are established for selecting the participating organization and individuals
- There is concrete evidence of full backing and commitment from the top administrative levels of each organization and from each group to be involved
- There is a clear division of labor, and authority structure and coordinating mechanisms have been demonstrated to work in field-test situations.

More specifically, this study brings to mind innumerable ideas on teacher education. Although few new insights turned up in this study, many standard suggestions for the improvement of teacher education are reiterated. The study also shows how difficult it is to implement new ideas—even good ones. It is not enough that educators come up with still more effective new methods or a more comprehensive plan. Ways must be found to put promising new approaches into practice, or else children will continue to be deprived of the fruits of reform efforts. The study underscores the urgency of giving more attention to finding effective strategies for implementing innovations.

It is difficult to know where to begin reflecting on the implications of the study for teacher education because the order in which ideas are discussed often suggests a priority of importance. In what follows the order is not indicative of importance, although implications of the greatest magnitude appear first.

An overriding conclusion of the study is that the scope of teacher education necessarily must be broad. Specifically, it must deal with broad social issues, psychological principles, human relationships, pedagogical skills, institutional change, and moral values. It was conceived broadly in the Teacher Corps' statement of purposes, but neither money nor planning went far enough to permit this vision to be implemented. For example, there was provision for school-college collaboration, but teachers were not adequately involved in planning and did not participate fully in the education of the interns. Consequently, they did

little to and for the program. They were not sufficiently committed to plans others had devised. When Teacher Corps interns arrived with innovative ideas, teachers were more apt to resist than try to help them succeed.

Community experience and study was also specified in Teacher Corps plans. However, neither college professors, team leaders, nor school teachers were adequately prepared or rewarded for leading such experience. They were more accustomed to the traditional internship in which interns provided direct assistance to the constituents of schools. In most schools which employed interns, consequently, community involvement was minimal; schools traditionally pay lip service to community relationships but limit their contacts to school concerns.

All of these aspects of teacher education have been advocated before. Some have been practiced, at least for a time, in teacher education programs. But in the Teacher Corps or elsewhere the total potential for bringing all components together has never been developed and maintained. There seems never to have been the skill, conviction, money, or long-range commitment to get all of these dimensions of teacher education into enough programs—to get them institutionalized—to bring about pervasive change.

Another aspect of this broad scope of teacher education is the inconsistency between rhetoric and practice. This is illustrated in what college professors say is good teaching and what they actually do in class. It is demonstrated by what a professor knows about low-income people and minority groups, and what he is able to do with them. It is exemplified by the avowed concern of a teacher for students and his actual behavior toward them.

There has long been agreement that claims and beliefs should be consistent with actions. But, as with other teacher education programs, in the Teacher Corps words and deeds were often far apart. The hypocrisy in this condition of teacher education is one of the educationist's most embarrassing problems, particularly as it is illustrated in discrepancies between verbalized educational theory and demonstrated practice in teaching. The teacher of teachers should be a master practitioner at whatever level she or he teaches. The teacher educator's expertise is pedogogy. If one cannot demonstrate expertise, her or his credibility is questionable. *Clearly, to be credible, teacher educators should practice what they preach. The Teacher Corps gave too little attention to this discrepancy.*

The Teacher Corps plan required special situations which could accommodate teams working together. It called for a practicum in which young idealists could learn to change the status quo. It needed conditions which might challenge and entice new people into teaching. The special situations required typically were not available. Interns who trained in teams were not able to intern in teams. The value of teaming was negated because it never got tested in the practicum; selected schools weren't organized that way. If teams working together are to be more than theoretical constructs, school settings must be at hand where teaming interns is possible and usual.

Situations where good teaching takes place and sites where good schools are in operation are not enough, however. They are not necessarily places where interns can experience good teacher education, however "good" is defined. To put it another way, the presence of competent teachers and good teaching does not ensure competent analyses and study of teaching, nor a place where learning to teach is possible. *Internship sites require both examples of competent practice and practitioners with the ability and desire to help a beginner learn to practice.*

Again, as with other teacher education programs, there was inadequate site evaluation before site selection and too few conditions were agreed upon to ensure adequate standards and a process for monitoring standards. Consequently, teachers were not prepared substantively or psychologically to contribute to teacher education. In fact, there was exploitation of interns.

Teacher educators who expect to be partners with school teachers in producing new teachers must select their partners, and vice versa. Schools with teacher education responsibilities should be inspected and selected on the basis of mutually accepted criteria for teacher education. No ordinary school can serve a clinical laboratory function, one for which the program is financed, staffed, and equipped. It is fundamental that its staff should be prepared for their task in both attitude and professional competence. If teacher centers materialize, this recommendation applies to them as well.

The Teacher Corps was depicted as a new system of teacher education. In seeking new people, in assuming the teacher should be a change agent, in extending the school into the community, and in getting into social action more directly, the Teacher Corps was intended to break definitions of teacher and school. But it never had much success in these undertakings. In many of these efforts the programs were stymied

by traditional ways of doing things. There were problems with expecting new behavior (e.g., from change-agent interns) without adequate training (sometimes without any training) for the role to be assumed. But more important, sufficient attention was not given to the organizational barriers and to the costs to those involved, in time and status; no consideration was given to ways of surmounting these barriers and costs.

Some will judge the Teacher Corps a failure for not achieving more in the above areas. We cannot accept that judgment. The program was less than advertised. But this study demonstrates again that, because of the broad scope of teacher education, the problems were not attacked with sufficient resources and with effective strategies. The lesson is clear. *If teacher education is to change, there must be sufficient balance and representation of all the groups involved to assure that no efforts will be subverted by certain groups or circumstances within the program. There must be a mechanism of governance to deal with decision making so that problems can be resolved.* Both representation and governance are difficult because teacher education does not fit into a single institution or structure. The work structures of the school and college must overlap, but they also require spheres of autonomy. The civil and social structure of the community is an entity which too often doesn't include the school and college.

Obviously, some new consortia must be established which are formal enough to have the power to assure that agreements made are carried out. If school, college, and community clearly remain separate entities, then a corporate consortium with agreements on purpose, representation, decision-making procedures, financing, and monitoring procedures must be set up.